

Administrative
Internal Use Only**EYES ONLY**

28 October 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Position Management & Compensation Division

FROM : Chief, Policies and Standards Branch

SUBJECT : Presidential Management Initiatives

1. You know of my concerns expressed several times in the past month over the Agency's responses to the Presidential Management Initiatives (PMI) and the fact that there has been dead silence on the part of the Comptroller, at least to us, since 20 September 1976 as to what PMCD need do next if anything. As you and [] have requested, I have again reviewed all of the material on this subject of which I am aware and, in an attempt to get some kind of a handle, have "spread sheeted" the PMI's which concern PMCD. These include action memos to the DCI from D/OMB dated 27 July 1976; the DDCI response to D/OMB dated 24 August 1976; and AD/OMB's response to CIA's response dated 16 September 1976 (See Attachment A). STAT

2. Initiative 1.(F) asks essentially for three things: (a) a review of staffing patterns to identify unnecessary layering and excessive organization subdivisions; (b) development of a plan to consolidate sub-units with similar and related functions; and (c) establishment of guidelines for "assistant to" positions. The Comptroller's answer to OMB on this Initiative was, in effect, that the Executive Advisory Group (EAG) is working on the "task of devising the best use of Agency personnel resources" and makes reference to Issue 5, Item III which, among other things, talks about the conduct of an "Inventory of Personnel". OMB's reply to the Comptroller's response points out some deficiencies in the latter and requests a revised plan by 21 October 1976. PMCD has no knowledge of the EAG's deliberations or findings on items (a), (b) or (c) above, nor, were we consulted or have any information on the "revised" plan that was due back on OMB on 21 October 1976.

3. Initiative 5.(E) (Also See Attachment A) calls for a systematic re-examination of internal Position and Classification Management systems and appropriate corrective actions to restrain grade escalation and eliminate duplication of work on under-utilization of personnel. The Comptroller's answer to OMB's initiative 5.(E) was, in effect, that the Agency will conduct an "Inventory of Personnel," which presumably will answer the OMB's questions. We, of course, have no knowledge of the "review of the 1978 program" and its results, the substance of the conduct of a Personnel Inventory, nor, how the results from such an inventory will be used to "adjust" the classification system. We presume that OMB was as confused by the Comptroller's response as we were. However, the OMB's last response was not very enlightening either and further compounded the Comptroller's confusion. The only saving grace here is that OMB, probably in desperation or politeness, did come back in a mild fashion and cite the Civil Service

Administrative
Internal Use Only**EYES ONLY**

MEM/CDP Pages 1 thru 5

Administrative
Internal Use Only

EYES ONLY

Commission Bulletin 250-7 as the basic referral document (See Attachment B) - the point, in our view, where the Comptroller should have started in the first place.

4. Without belaboring the subject, we have no better understanding of what is going on now, nor what we are expected to do, than we did a month ago. Our previous recommendation that someone find out from the Comptroller what, if anything, PMCD need do emerges again for several reasons. A careful reading of CSC Bulletin No. 250-7 (Attachment B) indicates a number of areas of Personnel Management which need to be reviewed. For example, sufficient disciplined examination of work organization and job classification to assess both the operational quality of position management and classification systems and their degree of compliance with law and regulation; a thorough assessment of the adequacy of the Agency's organization for classification including proper numbers of classifiers, degree of staff expertise, provisions and adequacy of classification training; special reviews of organizations where there is reason to believe that overgrading, undergrading, excessive organizational fragmentation or duplication of work may exist; and prompt corrective action in all situations where inaccurate classification or inefficient position management are found. There are many more. As can be seen, such reviews would require detail planning and large expenditures of time and effort on PMCD's or someone's part. Should we, therefore, commit large manpower efforts to studies which we do not know are either wanted or will be used? As we are well aware, PMCD is so over-burdened now that we are slipping from one thing to the next without being able to do justice to anything. Do we want to add to the burden unless we are sure of what we are doing? Secondly, be it not presumptuous for PMCD to undertake independent studies on subjects which the Director's coordinator (Comptroller) has said are being studied by the Executive Management Group? In our view, specific direction from on high is sorely needed on what, if anything, we are expected to do.

Attachments

A
B

STAT

EYES ONLY

Administrative
Internal Use Only

AS PRESENTED TO THE DCI BY
THE DIRECTOR OMB 27 July 1976

Approved For Release 2006/05/12 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000500120004-4
CIA (COMPTROLLER'S) REPLY DATED 24 Aug 1976

OMB'S RESPONSE TO CIA'S
RESPONSE DATED 16 Sept 1976

1. DECISION MAKING AND DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION

- F. Review current staffing patterns and structures to identify unnecessary position layering and excessive organizational subdivisions. Develop a plan to consolidate subunits with similar and related functions. Establish guidelines which will be reviewed by OMB for "assistant to" positions, including number for policy official and grade level. Procedures should be established to ensure at least Agency deputy level review of proposals to create new subdivisions and "assistant to" positions.

1. DECISION MAKING AND DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION

IV. ORGANIZATIONAL REVIEW

- A. Review current staffing patterns and organizational structures to identify unnecessary position layering* and excessive organizational subdivisions.

During the past several months, the Central Intelligence Agency has begun to make organizational changes to implement Executive Order 11905 issued by President Ford in February 1976. Responsibility for day-to-day operations of the Agency is now assigned to the Deputy Director for Central Intelligence (DDCI) who has begun a sweeping review of all phases of the Agency's work. To help him in this review, the DDCI has drawn his senior managers into an Executive Advisory Group (EAG) which has set for itself the task of devising the best use of Agency personnel resources. One vehicle that the EAG has chosen is a personnel inventory which will, *inter alia*, identify unnecessary position layering and "assistant to" positions. First steps in this process have already been taken and are described in detail in Issue 5, Item III., Position and Classification Management.

- B. Develop plan to consolidate sub-units.

The EAG is currently considering a number of substantial organizational changes. Consideration of consolidating organizational elements will follow.

(con'T)

1. DECISION MAKING AND DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION

IV. ORGANIZATIONAL REVIEW

Personnel inventory discussed in 5. III does not specify milestones or timetable for review of layering and excessive subdivision. By October 21, a revised plan should be submitted to include these omissions and greater detail on plans to consolidate sub-units and to develop guidelines for "assistant to" positions. A statement identifying review criteria for the personnel inventory is also requested. The IC Staff will be asked to develop an organizational review plan.

AS PRESENTED TO THE DCI BY
THE DIRECTOR OMB 27 July 1976

Approved For Release 2006/05/12 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000500120004-4
CIA (COMPTROLLER'S) REPLY DATED 24 Aug 1976

DIRECTOR/OMB'S RESPONSE TO CIA'S
RESPONSE DATED 16 Sept 1976

1. DECISION MAKING AND DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION

1. DECISION MAKING AND DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION

IV. ORGANIZATIONAL REVIEW (Con't)

- C. Establish guidelines for "assistant to" positions including number per policy official and grade level.

See Issue 5, Item III.

- D. Establish procedures to ensure at least Agency deputy level review of proposals to create new subdivisions and "assistant to" positions.

CIA Headquarters Regulation reads as follows:

Each Deputy Director is responsible for implementing the provisions of this regulation within the area of his jurisdiction and will... present proposals for significant organizational changes...to the Director for approval. Proposals should be forwarded, with appropriate justification through the Comptroller. (Significant organizational changes include such actions as the establishment or closure of a station or base [and] the transfer of a major function from one component to another.)

The Comptroller will review proposals for significant organizational changes...which have budgetary, manpower, or program implications among two or more directorates and submit appropriate recommendations to the Director.

*See also Issue 5, Item III, for further treatment of this area.

1. DECISION MAKING AND DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION

STAT

AS PRESENTED TO THE DCI BY
THE DIRECTOR OMB 27 July 1976

Approved For Release 2006/05/12 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000500120004-4

CIA (COMPTROLLER'S REPLY DATED 24 Aug 1976

DIRECTOR/OMB'S RESPONSE TO CIA'S
RESPONSE DATED 16 Sept 1976

5. PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Position and Classification Management - systematic reexamination of internal systems, and appropriate corrective action to restrain grade escalation and to eliminate duplication of work or under-utilization of personnel.

E. Agencies should, by September 3, begin a year-long program for the careful, systematic reexamination of internal position management and classification systems called for in the President's May 27 memorandum, in accordance with CSC instructions issued July 2.

OMB and CSC may specify special reviews or instructions on a selective basis, in agencies where there seem to be excessive problems of overgrading, duplication of work, or underutilization of personnel resources.

H. Agencies should evaluate their current internal systems for administering personnel ceilings to look for better ways of ensuring compliance with those ceilings and providing flexibility for intra-agency ceiling reallocation. A report on this evaluation should be submitted to OMB by September 21.

5. PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

III. Position and Classification Management

Systematically reexamine internal systems, and take appropriate corrective action to restrain grade escalation and to eliminate duplication of work or underutilization of personnel.

One of the results of the review of the 1978 program in July 1976 was recognition by the senior management of the Central Intelligence Agency of the need to have even more precise knowledge of how our present position allocations relate to individual substantive assignments. This has called into question the applicability of the present system of occupational coding.

Action Step: Conduct Inventory of Personnel

Milestone: Devise questions to be answered by inventory.

Est. Completion Date: 30 September 1976

Milestone: Plan implementation of inventory and make tentative work assignments.

Est. Completion Date: 15 October 1976

Milestone: Complete directorate inventories.

Est. Completion Date: 15 November 1976

Milestone: Compile results.

Est. Completion Date: 31 December 1976

Action Step: Review classification system in light of inventory results.

Est. Completion Date: 28 February 1977

Action Step: Adjust classification system as necessary.

Est. Completion Date: 15 April 1977

5. PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

III. Position and Classification Management

As indicated in item 2.IV., a statement identifying review criteria for the personnel inventory is requested. Civil Service Commission Bulletin No. 250-7 should be carefully reviewed as these criteria are developed. Report plan and timetable acceptable. This has been identified as an emphasis area and will be addressed by the OMB budget examiner during the FY 1978 budget review. In addition, it will be discussed with the IC Staff.

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

BULLETIN

Washington, D.C. 20415

BULLETIN NO. 250 - 7

July 2, 1976

SUBJECT: Review of Position Management and
Classification Systems

To Heads of Departments and Agencies:

Action date: Continuing, through
FY '77

In his memorandum of May 27, 1976, (Attachment 1), the President directed department and agency heads to ensure that their position management and classification systems "are operating effectively and in full compliance with applicable laws and regulations." The President's concern about optimum cost performance in government stems from three interrelated problems: the gradual rise in average grade of General Schedule employees; evidence of both overgrading and undergrading in many agencies; and repeated indications of poor work organization and under-utilization of employees in some organizations. His objectives are to assure that federal employees are equitably and lawfully compensated; that work is organized efficiently; and that employee skills and energies are utilized to the fullest extent possible. Effective position management and classification programs are prerequisite to the achievement of these objectives.

The President has charged the Civil Service Commission with responsibility for assessing and reporting on the quality of position management and classification programs in agencies, and on actions taken by agencies to implement his improvement objectives. We will provide a report to the President at the end of Fiscal Year 1977. (See Attachment 2, June 8, 1976, letter from Civil Service Commission Chairman Robert E. Hampton, to Heads of Departments and Agencies).

Since both position management and classification normally receive extensive coverage in Commission and agency personnel management evaluations, we plan to utilize regular CSC and agency internal personnel management evaluation and reporting procedures to collect the necessary information on actions taken to implement the President's improvement directive. We shall emphasize position management and classification systems review and problem analysis in all of our FY 77 evaluations, and ask that agencies

INQUIRIES: Analysis and Development Division, BPME, 63-24473

CODE: 250 - Personnel Management in Agencies

DISTRIBUTION: FPM

BTN. NO. 250 - 7 (2)

do the same in their ongoing internal personnel management evaluation programs. Analysis of these agency and Commission assessments and actions, combined with certain statistical data, will constitute a report to the President on the status of cost effective position management and the integrity of classification in Federal departments and agencies.

We envision this year's coordinated CSC-agency review process as follows. Agencies will, on their own initiative, undertake:

- Sufficient disciplined examination of work organization and job classification to assess both the operational quality of their position management and classification systems and their degree of compliance with law and regulation;
- Thorough assessment of the adequacy of the agency's organization for classification including proper numbers of classifiers, degree of staff expertise, provision and adequacy of classification training;
- Special reviews of positions and organizations where there is reason to believe that overgrading, undergrading, excessive organizational fragmentation or duplication of work may exist;
- Prompt corrective action in all situations where inaccurate classification or inefficient position management are found.

Position Management Review Agenda and Report Procedures

Attachment 3 is the position management program evaluation agenda for FY '77 Commission reviews. To enable us to prepare an aggregate report for the President, we request that agencies and installations follow this agenda as much as possible for the position management review portions of internal evaluations during the coming fiscal year. Two copies of the position management portions of agency internal evaluation installation, agency-wide, and installation self-evaluation reports, should be forwarded to the Director, Bureau of Personnel Management Evaluation (BPME), as soon as possible upon completion of on-site work. For each evaluation completed by the end of the third quarter, agencies should also submit a follow-up and impact assessment report to the Director, BPME, no later than September 10, 1977.

Additional CSC initiatives in support of the President's directive will include the following:

- A study of the causes of change in average grade. A special inquiry will be conducted during FY '77 to identify occupations and agencies which have experienced an unusual rise or fall in average grade, and to determine the causes. Agencies involved in this study will be notified before October 1, 1976.
- A study of the accuracy of position classification government-wide. We will undertake this year in all CSC-led evaluations an audit of a 1% random sample of positions. These audits will be in addition to the normal "problem seeking" audits regularly performed. We will ask agencies to do the same in their internal evaluations. Further guidance on this study will be provided by June 30, 1976.

Position management has long been a difficult area to deal with, possibly because it is largely dependent on management skill and judgment and is not rigidly governed by law and regulation. The elements of effective position management systems are described in OMB Circular A-64 and FPM chapter 312. Compliance with prescriptions in the documents must be addressed in agency internal reviews. However, it is very important that we all understand that cost effective work organization involves much more than controlling average grade and numbers of positions. As such, responsibility for position management rests largely with line managers who are intimately familiar with the nature of their work and the needs and potential of their employees.

The Civil Service Commission and agency personnel officials can and will assist agency managers at all levels in identifying and locating position management and classification deficiencies, e.g., through integrated analyses of information from employee attitude surveys, turnover studies, productivity trend data, classification surveys, etc. However, a more cost effective Federal service will be achieved only if agency managers and supervisors at all levels, across organization functions, with the assistance of personnel offices, work together to assure understanding of the precise nature of position management and classification deficiencies, and arrive at decisions which are based on the best available information on what kinds of alternative organization remedies are possible, at what prices and with what probable impact on the organization's mission and employees.

As you will note from the attached agenda, we are directing part of our review to the identification of areas in which the Civil Service Commission might provide more effective leadership to assure proper cost-effective position management throughout the Federal sector. We would especially welcome your suggestions.

This report has been cleared in accordance with FPMR 101-11.11 and assigned interagency report control number 0122-CSC-01.



Raymond J. Jacobson
Executive Director

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 27, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR THE HEADS OF
DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Over the past two decades, there has been a gradual but substantial rise in the average grade of General Schedule employees. Much of this rise is due to the fact that technological changes and other factors have brought about significant shifts in the makeup of the Federal workforce. These changes are reflected by a marked increase in the proportion of technical, professional, and managerial employees in the General Schedule.

We cannot assume, however, that this is the whole explanation. Recent reviews by the Civil Service Commission, the General Accounting Office, and the Office of Management and Budget indicate that classification and position management systems are not functioning as effectively as they should in a number of Federal agencies. There is evidence of both overgrading and undergrading because positions are either improperly described or inaccurately classified. This creates a situation which is unfair to all concerned. There are also indications in several agencies of excessive organization fragmentation, duplication of work and superfluous layers of supervision.

Where work has become substantially more complex or difficult, managers have a clear obligation to make commensurate adjustments in the way work is organized and in the grades of individual jobs. At the same time, there is an equally clear responsibility to ensure that undue grade increases are not allowed to occur. Position classification is a matter of law. Government managers are required to put jobs in their proper grades and Federal employees are entitled to equitable pay. Proper position management ensures that work is organized in a cost effective manner to provide optimum development and use of people's skills and energies. When either position classification or position management is deficient the result may be an unnecessary increase in the cost of Government.

Attachment 1 to BTN. NO. 250 - 7

(2)

I, therefore, am calling upon you to reexamine your internal position management and classification systems to ensure they are operating effectively and in full compliance with applicable laws and regulations. Agency heads will conduct this review in a manner to be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission and will report to the Commission both the actions they have taken and the results of those actions.

At the same time, the Civil Service Commission will pursue vigorously its continuing programs for evaluating agency performance and bringing about corrective action in the areas of position management and classification. Where the Commission finds extensive overgrading, undergrading, or underutilization of personnel resources, it will bring its findings to the attention of the Agency head concerned. In addition, the Commission and the Office of Management and Budget will work with the agencies involved to correct such problems, and may prescribe special instructions where warranted.

Harold R. Ford



UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20415

June 8, 1976

PERSONALLY ADDRESSED TO HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS
AND AGENCIES

In his memorandum of May 27, 1976, President Ford called upon each of us to reexamine our position management and classification systems. The President's objective is two-fold: to assure the just and lawful compensation of Federal employees, and to assure that work is organized and employee skills and energies are utilized for maximum cost performance. These processes--position management and position classification--are the very core of the Federal personnel management system. Their strength and integrity are essential to cost effective government.

Position classification is clearly defined by law and regulation. What is needed here is assurance that your agency's system is in full legal and regulatory compliance and that the management controls by which classification integrity is maintained are in place and working. Position management, though partially governed by regulation, is greatly dependent upon management skill and judgment, informed by experience and our growing knowledge of the complex forces that produce motivated employees and effective organizations. We must make certain that our work structures and organizational designs are systematically being assessed for improvement, and that the allocation of positions and deployment of people reflect the best we know about managing human resources. Success in meeting these objectives clearly depends upon the active commitment of managers at every organizational level across the planning, budget, personnel and, particularly, line functions.

Since both position management and classification are regularly reviewed in our personnel management evaluation program, we see no need for additional reporting. To assess agency progress, we shall conduct more intensive reviews of these areas this year, and ask that you do the same through your internal personnel management evaluation system. Guidance for these reviews will be issued shortly.

Your personal interest in and attention to these efforts will enable us collectively to meet the President's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

Robert E. Hampton
Chairman

AGENDA FOR POSITION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM REVIEW

Introduction

"Position management" is the term used to describe the key management actions involved in the process of organizing work to accomplish the missions of Federal departments and agencies. It involves, essentially, the determination of the needs for positions, the determination of required skills and knowledges, and the organization, grouping, and assignment of duties and responsibilities among positions.

Position structures should be designed to utilize the most effective work processes, equipment, procedures, methods and techniques, and should reflect a keen understanding of the human factors operating in every work situation. Traditionally, concepts of cost-effective work and position design have been based largely on mechanistic models of organizations, with secondary concern for motivation and job satisfaction factors. However, in recent years, the importance of these factors has become increasingly evident. They should therefore constitute a major element of consideration in determining the cost/benefit of alternative organizational structures. For example, work structures which do not provide for career development and advancement can contribute to excessive turnover, which has many cost and productivity implications. Or, excessive organizational fragmentation, supervisory layering and duplication of work can result in under-utilization of employees, overgrading, excessive review levels and time, and reduced morale among employees, all of which are costly and counterproductive.

There are no absolute rules for managers to follow in the complex and evolving art of position management; however, there are basic system requirements for position management in government agencies which are designed to assure that work structures and organizational designs are systematically being assessed for improvement, that positions are correctly classified, and that the allocation of positions and deployment of people reflect the best that we know about managing human resources. This review is therefore directed to assessing the quality of position management systems in agencies, identifying problem areas, and prescribing appropriate corrective action.

Basic Elements of a Position Management System

The principal directives governing position management are contained in OMB Circular A-64, as amended, and FPM chapter 312. The nine basic elements of a Position Management System are the following:

1. Assignment of responsibility to managers for work organization and position management.
2. Utilization of total staff resources (budget, planning, management analysis, personnel, etc.)
3. Establishment of position authorization and employment controls.
4. Position vacancy review and control.
5. Position reclassification review.
6. Approval of organizational changes.
7. Interagency sharing of personnel resources.
8. Employment reporting system.
9. Conduct of special reviews.

Methods of Problem Identification

There are readily at hand a number of useful tools which, when used together, help to pinpoint position management problem areas:

- CSC Form 1088, Survey of Personnel Management Questionnaire: Groups of questions on this employee attitude survey focus on adequacy and quality of staffing, work allocation and skill utilization, opportunity for skills development and career advancement, work quality and organization effectiveness. Employee responses can be grouped by grade level, organization location, length of service and other factors, enabling analysts to locate and partially define problem position management areas. (The Analysis and Development Division, BPME, offers agencies CSC 1088 questionnaire processing, and percentage and percentile analysis, on a reimbursable basis).
- Turnover statistics: An analysis of turnover statistics--who is leaving, by organization location, grade and position; reasons for leaving; related staffing, training, production problems, etc.--provides good position management problem leads.
- Productivity trend data: When charted, productivity trend data readily makes visible decreases and increases in organization efficiency. When matched with work organization events, e.g., automation of a function, reorganization, management change, etc., and correlated with attitude survey results and turnover analysis, solid insights into the nature and location of position management problems can result.

- Organization charts, functional statements and position descriptions: Review of these documents can point up excessive supervisory layering, overlap of functions, and possible misclassification.
- Sick leave usage, complaints, grievances, upward mobility statistics, overtime trends, use of temporary appointments: Analyses of these types of data can, in some instances, tie in with identified position management problem areas.
- Structured classification audit sample: Based on potential problems identified through analytical activities such as those described above, an in-depth classification audit of selected organizations and groups of positions, should provide further definition of the nature and location of position management deficiencies.

Additional guidance on reviewing position management program operations can be found under "Planning and Organizing Work," section S2-2, book II of FPM Supplement (Internal) 273-73, Evaluating Personnel Management, pp. II-17 - II-28.

Issues for Evaluation

1. Agency response to the President's directive. The President has directed Federal agency managers to examine their internal position management and classification systems to ensure their effective operation and to assess conformance with OMB and Civil Service Commission policy and guidance.
 - How has the agency and/or installation responded to the President's directive? What review/improvement actions are planned or in effect at the installation/agency? (Include implementation time-frame.) What is the team's assessment of the adequacy of these plans, in terms of identifying problems and improving position management?
2. Compliance with system prescriptions and guidance in OMB Circular A-64 and FPM chapter 312.
 - 2-1. OMB Circular A-64 (as amended) calls for nine specific elements of position management systems.
 - To what extent does the agency/installation have the prescribed system in place. How well is each element working?
 - 2-2. FPM chapter 312 describes the goals of effective position management, and logical steps for effective systems operation, particularly in subchapter 2 and appendix 312-A (Operation MUST).

- To what extent are these guidelines operational? Cite examples.
- 2-3. Some agencies/installations have exceptionally good position management systems with published guides and other tools and documents which could serve as useful models for other agencies.
- Does this installation/agency have published materials which might be helpful to others? If so, please send copies to CSC Clearinghouse on Productivity and Organizational Effectiveness, BPME.
3. Identification of Problems. If position management systems are not functioning effectively, why not? The following are among the possible problems to explore: For each of the problems defined below, please identify the most probable cause(s) and prescribe remedies (action items).
- 3-1. Do supervisors and managers at all levels thoroughly understand the purpose and concepts of position management? How have they been advised, trained, encouraged to focus on effective position management? Are they committed to its objectives? Evidence?
- 3-2. Are the concepts of sound position management supported but the processes for implementation inadequate (i.e., is it a techniques problem?) In what areas is implementation weak or absent?
- 3-3. How are position management decisions made? By whom and when? (Chart the location of each key area of staff or line responsibility and typical flow of the position management decision-making process). Are there particular points in the process which impede fruitful results in achieving sound position management? Discuss.
- 3-4. Is the personnel staff carrying out all of its position management responsibilities? What steps must be taken to improve personnel staff performance in cost-effective position management?
- 3-5. Does the organization have a sufficient number of classifiers, adequately trained, to support personnel responsibilities in the position management system? If not, what actions are being taken to recruit and train classifiers?

- 3-6. What position management problems have been found during previous agency or CSC evaluations of classification accuracy, and what remedial actions were taken? With what results?
- 3-7. Is the Civil Service Commission doing all that it should/could to provide effective leadership in assuring strong position management programs? What specific CSC actions are needed?
- 3-8. Are current authorities adequate for personnel staffs, agency managers, and the CSC to act on position management issues? Should OMB Circular A-64 and FPM chapter 312 be revised? How? What changes are needed?
- 3-9. What does management know or attempt to learn about the cost-performance of alternative position management decisions--not just the personnel dollar cost over time, but the longer range overall organizational performance costs?
- 3-10. How do personnel people assist in looking at and identifying the long term organization benefits of various position structures and their comparative total price tags? Do they make visible these alternative position structures and their potential organization performance consequences, in a timely way? With what results?
- 3-11. Sound position management operations must be closely linked with the budget process and with overall agency planning and management. Is it? How? Results?
- 3-12. Are the concepts of organization design inappropriate or out-of-date? For example, should management pay greater attention to "quality of worklife" issues in the organization (e.g., worker autonomy, participation, equity, opportunity for development?) How? To what extent? Evidence?

Labor-Management Considerations

Agencies and activities having exclusive recognition with labor organizations should be alert to any labor-management implications involved in this review. When conducting employee attitude surveys, particular reference should be given to the Federal Labor Relations Council decision in NASA and LBJ Space Center (NASA), (FLRC No. 74A97, FLRC Rpt. No. 84).

Approved For Release 2006/05/12 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000500120004-4

Page Denied

Approved For Release 2006/05/12 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000500120004-4